



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/568,014

02/10/2006

Lukas Kupper

DE 030289

2297

24737

7590

03/25/2008

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

RALEIGH, DONALD L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/568,014	Applicant(s) KUPPER ET AL.	
	Examiner DONALD L. RALEIGH	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/20/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment, filed on February 10, 2006 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the instant application.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kinouchi (US PG Pub 2002/0039289).

Regarding claims 1, 9 and 12, Kinouchi discloses the invention of Claim 1 for a vehicle headlight (abstract, line 1) with a bulb (1, the bulb and base are shown as one in the figure) surrounding a light source (2, filament) with a lamp base (shown with (1)) arranged at the end of the bulb (1) for supporting the lamp (Figure 1 shows it is supporting the bulb in the reflector (11 and 12)) with a reflector (11 & 12) of the headlight and with at least one lens structure (30) present in or at an upper side and/or lower side of the bulb (1)(on the upper side per Figure 1) which structure is arranged

such that at least a portion of the light radiated by the light source (2) is redirected into a reflector region lying farther to the front. (Figure 1 shows the light rays (m & n) redirected forward, characterized in that the lamp (bulb (1)) comprises a filament (2)(Paragraph [0019], line 2), and characterized in that the lamp has a low-beam function.(Paragraph [0019], lines 1-2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muto et al (US Patent No. 6,169,367) in view of Ishigami et al (US PG Pub 2003/0209986)

Regarding Claim 1, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, a lamp (1) for a vehicle headlight (Column 1, lines 14-15), with a bulb (11)(discharge chamber) surrounding a light source (3)(electrodes) and with at least one lens structure (11a) present in or at an upper side and/or lower side of the bulb (11)(Figure 3 shows (11a) on both sides. Muto fails to disclose with a lamp base arranged at an end of the bulb (11) for supporting the lamp (1) within a reflector of the headlight, which structure is arranged such that at least a portion of the light radiated by the light source (3) in the direction of

the reflector close to the lamp base is redirected into a reflector region lying farther to the front.

In the same field of endeavor, Ishigami teaches , at least in Figure 6, a discharge lamp used in an automobile headlight (Paragraph [0003] lines 9-10), with a lamp base (5a) arranged at an end of the bulb (see Figure 6) for supporting the lamp (5) within a reflector (6) of the headlight, which structure is arranged such that a portion of the light radiated by the light source (2, electrodes) is redirected into a reflector region lying farther to the front. (Figure 6 shows no obstruction in the path of the light generated from (2), therefore, at least a portion of the light will be projected forward.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to incorporate the reflector and base of Ishigami into the bulb and lens structure of Muto in order for at least a portion of the light to be projected forward.

Regarding Claim 2, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, a lamp characterized in that the lens structure (11a) comprises a concave lens (11a)(Column 3, lines 52-53).

Regarding Claim 5, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, a lamp characterized in that the lens structure (11a) comprises at least an outer boundary surface arranged at the upper side or lower side of the bulb (11). Muto discloses that the surface is directed obliquely to the rear in the direction of the lamp end sections. Although, it is not explicitly shown in Figure 1 which end of the bulb of Muto would be placed in the base and reflector of Ishigami, since the vessel is concave and symmetrical, either end can be placed in the

Art Unit: 2879

base and reflector of Ishigami, thus, a surface of the lens structure (11a) would be directed obliquely to the rear in the direction of the base of Ishigami in a concave lens structure.

Regarding Claim 7, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, a lamp characterized in that the lens structure (11a) extends from a rear end of the bulb (11) at the lamp base side along a longitudinal bulb axis in the direction of the front end of the bulb (11) at least up to a central region of the light source. The lamp of Muto when incorporated in the base of Ishigami would have a lens structure that extends the entire length of the bulb (11).

Regarding Claim 8, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, that the lens structure (11a) is at least partly integral with the bulb (11).

Regarding Claim 10, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, a pair of electrodes (3) which would provide a discharge arc (A) between them (Column 4, lines 11-12).

Regarding Claim 11, Muto discloses, at least in Figure 1, that the lamp (11) comprises a plurality of light sources (3, two electrodes), the lens structure (11a) being arranged such that at least a portion of the light radiated by one of the light sources (3) in the direction of the region of the reflector close to the lamp base is redirected into a region of the reflector lying farther to the front. Since the surface is concave, at least a portion of the light would be directed forward.

Regarding Claim 13, Muto, as modified by Ishigami, discloses a motor vehicle headlight (Ishigami, Para. [0003], lines 9-10) with a reflector (Ishigami (6)) and a lamp (Ishigami (5)) arranged therein.

Claims 3-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muto in view of Ishigami and further in view of Trentelman (US Patent No. 6,676,472).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Muto as modified by Ishigami, fails to exemplify the head lamp of Claim 1 characterized in that the lens structure comprises a prism.

In the same field of endeavor, Trentelman teaches, at least in Figure 7, a lamp envelope (52)(Column 6, line 6) with a prism structure (64)(microscopic grooves)(multiple prisms) that can be used in an automobile headlight (Column 1, lines 37-40) to redirect light through sheet (56)(envelope) to form a band of light (Column 6, lines 14-15). Furthermore, the structure of this envelope is the same as the envelope of Muto and would be appropriate to fit in the base and reflector of Ishigami.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to incorporate the prism structure of Trentelman into the lens structure of Muto as modified by Ishigami and provide a headlight bulb that redirects light through the envelope to form a band of light.

Regarding Claim 6, Muto as modified by Ishigami fails to exemplify the head light of claim 1, characterized in that the lens structure, as viewed from the light source is positioned essentially in a region of the bulb at the lamp base side.

In the same field of endeavor, Trentelman discloses an envelope body with a lens structure concentrated at the ends of the envelope (52)(either of which could be the base end) which could be inserted in the base and reflector of Ishigami and redirect light through sheet (56) to form a band of light (Col.6, lines 13-14) in an auto headlight (Column 1, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to incorporate the lens structure of Trentelman that is positioned essentially in a region of the bulb at the lamp base side into the base and reflector of Ishigami and the bulb of Muto in order to redirect light to form a band of light.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DONALD L. RALEIGH whose telephone number is (571)270-3407. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Donald L Raleigh/
Examiner, Art Unit 2879

/Mariceli Santiago/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879